



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mm
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,589	01/30/2004	John M. Koegler	200313829-1	8582

22879 7590 09/19/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ROY, SIKHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/769,589

Applicant(s)

KOEGLER ET AL.

Examiner

Sikha Roy

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 23-30 and 35-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 23-30 and 35-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on July 7, 2006 has been entered and is acknowledged by the Examiner.

Cancellation of claims 10-22 and 31-34 has been entered.

New claims 35-40 have been added.

Currently claims 1-9, 23-30 and 35-40 are pending.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the 'the support structure comprising a rod and potential coupler comprises a wire running along the rod' as claimed in claim 39 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al.

Regarding claim 1 Ooms discloses (Fig. 2 column 1 lines 35-37, column 4 lines 15-34) a reflector assembly for use in projection purpose comprising a reflector 2 including a reflector opening, a startup element (starting aid) 31 fixedly coupled (through a connection conductor 34 which passes through a opening 35 and connected to the contact member 29 provided on the reflector) to the reflector 2 wherein the reflector and the startup element are coupled to a lamp 10.

Ooms fails to disclose the replaceable coupling of the lamp assembly.

Luallin in the same field of endeavor discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 lines 7-31) a headlamp including a plastic parabolic reflecting surface 12 with an opening 14 for receiving the light bulb 22 of a replaceable light bulb assembly. It is to be noted that replaceable lamp assembly provides the benefit of replacing a fused light bulb which can no longer be used without replacing the reflector and the lamp assembly. This results in reducing the manufacturing cost.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the lamp assembly of Ooms by a replaceably coupled lamp assembly to the reflector as taught by Luallin for the benefit of replacing a fused light bulb which can no longer be used without replacing the reflector and the lamp assembly and thus reducing the manufacturing cost.

Regarding claim 2 Ooms discloses the startup element comprises a coil 33 (antenna 33 is wound few turns around).

Regarding claim 4, Ooms discloses the lamp assembly further comprises a potential coupler 34 (current conductor) configured to couple the startup element to a potential source.

Regarding claim 5 Ooms discloses (Fig. 2 column 4 lines 30-34) a structural element 34 (the potential coupler) coupled to the reflector 2 and the startup element where the potential coupler 34 runs along the structural element.

Regarding claim 6 Ooms discloses the potential coupler 34 comprising a structural element for supporting the startup element.

Regarding claim 7 Luallin discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 lines 49-67 column 3 lines 1-15) a latching assembly (retainer) 18 to engage the lamp header 26 of the lamp assembly.

Regarding claim 8 Ooms discloses (Fig. 2 column 3 lines 41-45) the reflector comprises a parabolic (paraboloidally curved) reflector.

Regarding claim 23 Ooms and Luallin disclose the method of forming a reflector assembly comprising affixing a startup element 33 to a reflector 2, coupling a latching assembly 18 to the opening defined in the reflector wherein the startup element and the latching assembly cooperate to allow replaceable coupling of a lamp to the reflector assembly.

Regarding claim 24 Ooms and Luallin disclose the startup element comprises a startup coil 33.

Regarding claim 25 Ooms and Luallin disclose the method further comprises coupling a wire 34 to the startup element wherein the conducting wire is configured to couple the startup element 33 to a potential source.

Regarding claim 26 Ooms and Luallin disclose the method comprises coupling a structural element 35 to the reflector 2 for supporting the startup element wherein the wire 34 runs along the structural element 35.

Regarding claim 27 Ooms disclose the wire comprising a structural element configured to support the startup element.

Regarding claim 28 Ooms and Luallin disclose the latching assembly is configured to engage a lamp header of the lamp assembly.

Regarding claim 29 Ooms and Luallin disclose the reflector comprises a parabolic reflector.

Regarding claim 35 Ooms and Luallin disclose all the limitations same as of claim 1 and furthermore Ooms discloses a support structure 34 for fixedly coupling the start up element 31 to the reflector 2, so that the start up element is supported within the reflector.

Regarding claim 36 Ooms discloses the start up element comprises a coil 33.

Regarding claims 38 and 40 Ooms discloses the support structure comprises a potential coupler 34 (current conductor) configured to couple the startup element to a potential source.

Claims 3, 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 3,733,599 to Fantozzi.

Claim 3 differs from Ooms and Luallin in that Ooms and Luallin do not exemplify the startup element comprising a shield.

Fantozzi in analogous art of triggering a flash lamp discloses (Fig. 2 column 1 lines 66 through column 2 line 3, column 3 lines 51-62) a startup element comprising a shield 25 (conductive member having curved surface area) used as startup (triggering)

element. Fantozzi further notes that this design of the startup element reduces the amplitude of voltage required for starting the lamp and hence reduces temperature build-up in the bulb envelope.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to substitute the coil startup element of Ooms and Luallin by a shield type startup element as taught by Fantozzi for reducing the amplitude of voltage required for starting the lamp and hence reducing temperature build-up in the bulb envelope.

Claim 37 essentially recites the same limitation as claim 3 and hence is rejected for the same reason.

Claims 9 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,078,128 for Gagnon et al.

Regarding claim 9 Ooms and Luallin do not disclose the reflector being elliptical.

Gagnon in pertinent art discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 21-26) the lamp housing 12 comprises reflective parabolic, elliptical forms, well known in the lamp art.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an elliptic reflector for the lamp assembly of Ooms and Luallin as suggested by Gagnon based on its suitability in the application, the parabolic reflectors being well known in the art.

Claim 30 essentially recites the same limitation as of claim 9 and hence is rejected for the same reason.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,213,170 to Kimball et al.

Regarding claim 39 Ooms and Luallin do not exemplify support structure comprising a rod and potential coupler comprising a wire running along the rod.

Kimball in analogous art of reflector lamp discloses (Figs. 1,2 column 1 lines 21-30) a lamp is supported in a reflector by support rods 3 which are connected to the lead-in wires 4 and the reflector. It is noted that the support rods support the lamp structure within the reflector. Although Kimball does not exemplify the wire running along the rod it is well known in the art to have the wire guided through the rod for preventing any breakage and exposing the wire to surrounding.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the support structure of Ooms and Luallin by a support rod fixedly coupled to the reflector for supporting the starting element within the reflector as suggested by Kimball and the potential coupler passing through the rod for providing protection for the potential coupling wire.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Ooms does not disclose the starting element 33 fixedly coupled to the reflector the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ooms discloses that the startup element is connected to a conduction wire 34 which passes through an opening in the reflector 2 and is fixed with the contact member 29 provided on the surface of the reflector. This configuration indeed provides fixed coupling (fixed linking or permanent connection) of the starting aid with the reflector. The Examiner disagrees to applicant's allegation that Ooms teaches that the startup element is supported on the lamp vessel and asserts that the claims (1,23) are read from Ooms' disclosure and the rejection is proper.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sikha Roy

Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879